

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 523

UD 028 279

AUTHOR Higgins, Catherine; And Others
TITLE I Have a Dream in Washington, D.C. Initial Report.
INSTITUTION Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation,
Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Comparative Analysis;
*Disadvantaged Youth; *Dropout Prevention; Dropout
Programs; Economically Disadvantaged; Helping
Relationship; Intermediate Grades; *Private Financial
Support; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation;
*Pupil Personnel Services; Secondary Education;
*Student Financial Aid; Tuition Grants; Urban
Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *District of Columbia Public Schools; *Prince Georges
County Public Schools MD

ABSTRACT

This report presents an independent evaluation of E. Lang's I Have a Dream (IHAD) model intervention for disadvantaged youth as it has been implemented in three schools in the Greater Washington (District of Columbia) area. Sixty IHAD participants are randomly selected as they enter sixth or seventh grade for higher education tuition guarantees provided by two or three sponsors each and intervention-support services during middle and secondary school years. Findings for this report are based on a 1-year study of three classes and on interviews, observations, and school records of IHAD and non-IHAD participants. The review found that the Washington IHAD program is a promising intervention. The study gives clear evidence that the IHAD intervention has targeted and reached highly disadvantaged youth early enough in the participants' lives that academic and social problems can be addressed. Interviews with participants suggest that IHAD may have positive effects on educational aspirations and performance. The size and generosity of the sponsors' financial commitment impresses the participants and gives them a special connection to the world of success. However, some services considered necessary are provided unevenly and ineffectively reflecting the informal structure of the program and the sponsors' autonomy. Statistical data are presented in one table. A list of seven references and a discussion of the research methodology are included. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

P/PV

I Have a Dream in Washington, D.C.

Initial Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY


N. Jaffe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Winter 1991

2
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public/Private Ventures is a national, not-for-profit corporation that designs, manages, and evaluates social policy initiatives aimed at helping people whose lack of preparation for the work force hampers their chances for productive lives. P/PV's work is supported by funds from both the public and private sectors.

Rex D. Adams

Chairman
of the Board

Michael A. Bailin

President

Gary Walker

Executive
Vice President

Board of Directors

Rex D. Adams

Michael A. Bailin

Judy Barker

Angela Ginner-Brown

Roy J. Bostrock

Alan K. Campbell

Hilary Ruthven Corbin

Alvin A. Dem

Linda Darling-Hammond

Alice F. Emerson

Sandra Feldman

Harold Howe II

Stephen Oppenheimer-Negus

Marion Pines

John W. Porter

Mitchell Sussloff

Corporate Associates

American Express

Philanthropic Program

Amgen Foundation

ARR Services, Inc.

Boston Foundation

BP America

USJFA Foundation

Corporate Partnership Ltd.

Deer Ziffer Reynolds, Inc.

Exxon Corporation

General Motors Corporation

Independence Blue Cross

Mega Oil Foundation

Penn Mutual Charitable Fund

Pfizer, Inc.

The Prudential Insurance Co.

of America

Scott Paper Co.

Texaco, Inc.

Union Carbide Corporation

United Technologies

Research Advisory Committee

Frank Furstenberg

Robertson Hollister

Henry Jovan

Frank Levy

Arda Summigs

Marta Tienda



I Have a Dream in Washington, D.C.

Initial Report

**by: Catherine Higgins
Kathryn Furano
Catharine Toso
Alvia Y. Branch**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This one-year assessment of three classes sponsored by the Greater Washington I Have A Dream Foundation was funded by The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Public/Private Ventures wishes to thank the Foundation and in particular Peter Gerber for their support.

The data analysis for this report benefitted from the expertise in school records management acquired over the last five years by P/PV's MIS department. Specifically, Batia Trietsch coordinated the processing of school and questionnaire data, and Eleanor Hammond applied her usual tireless assistance to compilation of the master list and questionnaire administration. Angela Everman supplied the programming for the data analysis, and Cynthia Sipe, director of quantitative research, analyzed the data. Natalie Jaffe's inspired editorial assistance guided all phases of authorship and production. Ja'net Reid processed the text. Michael Callaghan copy edited the text and oversaw production, and Eileen Harris proofread the final version.

P/PV extends grateful appreciation to the sponsors and staff at the Greater Washington I Have a Dream Foundation for providing access to all aspects of their program. The study required unusual cooperation from the three project coordinators, and, like Dreamers, we became grateful for the energy and attention they extended to address our needs. P/PV also thanks the school district officials who enabled us to collect school records and administer the questionnaire; and the principals and assistant principals who answered our information queries, explained school records, retrieved signed forms from youth and assembled groups for testing, all while conducting their regular tasks. The 14 Dreamers who consented to be interviewed by P/PV provided invaluable insights and merit our special thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE MODEL	5
III. BECOMING A DREAMER	13
IV. PROGRAM SUPPORTS	21
V. CONCLUSIONS AND CONCERNS	29
REFERENCES	35
APPENDIX	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the first independent evaluation of a replication of Eugene Lang's celebrated I Have a Dream intervention for disadvantaged youth. The report describes the I Have a Dream (IHAD) model as it has been implemented in three schools in the Greater Washington D.C. area.

A recent U.S. Government Accounting Office survey identified 111 tuition-guarantee programs in the U.S. All operated under the assumption that the cost of higher education is a significant barrier to educational achievement among disadvantaged youth. Seventy programs featured sponsorship of a class by an individual, group of individuals, university or business. Programs that use the I Have a Dream name and logo copyrighted by Lang are one type of sponsorship program.

Findings for this report are based on a one-year study of three classes affiliated with the Greater Washington I Have a Dream Foundation. Assessments are based on interviews, observations and school records of Dreamers and non-Dreamers in the same grade at the three junior high schools in the Greater Washington area.

The three classes selected for the study participated in a program that conforms to Lang's model. Groups of 60 Dreamers are "randomly" selected as they enter sixth or seventh grade. Two or three sponsors or benefactors (a modification of Lang's individual sponsorship) fund the tuition guarantee and support services, and take an active interest in Dreamers. A project coordinator, hired by sponsors, commits him or herself to a mentoring/case management role with Dreamers for six years, until they graduate from high school.

P/PV's one-year review found that the Greater Washington D.C. IHAD program is a promising intervention with the potential to help small numbers of disadvantaged youth achieve higher educational outcomes. However, because the classes participating in the study are all in the early years of the intervention, P/PV could not assess the model's effect on such outcomes as high school graduation and college enrollment. The study did yield several findings about the implementation of the IHAD model and the process by which it affects youth.

The study gives clear evidence that the IHAD intervention has targeted and reached highly disadvantaged youth. School data and interviews with youth confirm that Dreamers in the three schools are predominantly minority youth from impoverished neighborhoods. Because the severity of the needs of some youth occasionally threatens to overwhelm sponsors and project coordinators, the report recommends that the Foundation develop a coordinated

referral policy to social service agencies in such areas as housing, child welfare and health care.

The report also concludes that the timing of the IHAD intervention seems to be educationally and developmentally propitious. Because IHAD targets youth at a comparatively early age, it has the potential to address academic and social problems before they jeopardize school enrollment. As early adolescents, youth are at least as receptive to adult as to peer influences. However, their receptivity to the IHAD intervention may change as they age and peer relationships assume dominance.

Interviews with Dreamers suggest that IHAD may have positive effects on their educational aspirations and performance. The size and generosity of the financial commitment made by sponsors impresses Dreamers and reinforces positive attitudes toward education. In addition, support from project coordinators provides daily reinforcement of the importance of education. Project coordinators advocate for Dreamers within a school and leverage additional resources, such as tutoring, trips or concrete assistance during emergencies. They can and do drive youth to school, thus improving attendance, and bring in parents for teacher consultations, thus increasing parental involvement.

Adult relationships provided by the intervention furnish another layer of support. Although sponsors may not know their names, Dreamers perceive them as caring and powerful in ways that transcend the financial guarantee. Relationships with project coordinators evoke affection, gratitude and respect. The combination of caring from both distant (sponsors) and proximate (project coordinators) adults seems to be a potent formula. The potential of its application over six years of a youth's school career remains to be assessed.

P/PV's initial study also found that some of IHAD's services, which sponsors consider necessary, are provided unevenly and ineffectively. The tutoring component is especially valuable to youth but varies considerably among schools, as do enrichment activities and incentive awards. The 1990 summer program failed to attract more than 50 percent of eligible Dreamers on a consistent basis. This variation reflects the informal structure of the IHAD Foundation and the autonomy sponsors enjoy in the management of their Dreamer classes.

In summary, this assessment of youth's early experience with the IHAD model appears to confirm the value of tuition guarantees and consistent, on-the-scene staffing to increase at-risk youth's feelings of connection to schooling. Both of these approaches are also being used in other education programs and in interventions that include mentoring and case managers.

However, IHAD's unique contribution may be exclusive to the

private sector: an association with a wealthy benefactor. Whether publicly funded interventions can deliver the sense of a special connection to the world of success that IHAD confers, or elicit the high expectations that youth and some school officials attribute to sponsors may be the largest challenge that IHAD poses for public policy.

I. INTRODUCTION

"An impending disaster" is how newspapers describe the disparity between the educational preparedness of the work force and the job-entry requirements of the workplace. Not surprisingly, the disaster strikes hardest at the same group that is hardest hit by poverty--minority youth, whose educational achievement--measured in terms of high school and college graduation--continues to lag far behind that of white youth. Yet minority youth will be needed to fill 56 percent of the new jobs that will open up between 1986 and the year 2000. (The New York Times, 1989)

Impatient with public education's failings in preparing tomorrow's work force, the private sector has responded with a variety of interventions in the educational process. Many institutional interventions, such as school/business collaborations, have been carefully assessed. But grass-roots interventions like tuition-guarantee programs, while receiving wide media coverage, have received little formal evaluation.

A recent survey conducted by the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) identified four distinct types of tuition-guarantee models, which it labeled "sponsorship," "last dollar," "university-based" and "pay-for-grades." All operate under the assumption that the cost of higher education is a significant barrier to educational achievement among disadvantaged youth.

Of the 111 tuition-guarantee programs identified by the GAO, 70 are sponsorship types. Only 37 of the 70 responded to the GAO's mail and telephone survey; none of these had been formally evaluated and few were compiling even descriptive data about their programs. The GAO concluded that "little is being learned about which of the programs' assumptions may be correct," thus limiting the social usefulness of the intervention to the fortunate few individuals who receive its benefits directly. (U.S. GAO, 1990)

The best-known of the sponsorship programs is Eugene Lang's celebrated I Have a Dream Project in New York City, which started when Lang promised to pay college tuition fees for a class of sixth-graders then preparing to graduate from his elementary school alma mater. The publicity surrounding Lang's guarantee helped it become the formal prototype for many similar programs. By Summer 1990, more than 140 classes had been sponsored under Lang's I Have a Dream (IHAD) umbrella, at an approximate cost of \$50 million.

Unlike most public-sector interventions or demonstrations, the IHAD model was never formally designed. Lang's offer of a tuition guarantee was apparently spontaneous; he added social and educational supports only after his contacts with the youth indi-

cated their need for them. Nevertheless, the basic features of Lang's intervention--a sponsor, a tuition guarantee, a project coordinator and additional support services--have been replicated in all sponsorship programs that carry the I Have a Dream name.

The IHAD model is attractive to the social policy community because it contains elements consistent with current thinking about best practices in education for disadvantaged youth. For example, educational research suggests that high expectations for achievement, embodied in the tuition guarantee, can lead to improved academic performance. (U.S. Department of Education, 1986) Longitudinal studies suggest that a relationship with a caring adult can protect a youth with a disadvantaged background from social and educational failure. (Rutter, 1987)

In addition, the model represents a sustained intervention that is timed to address serious social problems in their early stages, or preventively. The familiar criticism "too little, too late," frequently leveled against single-focus programs, is difficult to apply to the IHAD model, which addresses a range of needs when youth are still in their early adolescent years.

In many ways, IHAD recalls the great private charities of the 19th century, when benefactors donated "not alms but a friend." (Lubove, 1977) With the growth of publicly funded charity after the New Deal, the importance of private charity for the poor receded. However, the 1980s appear to have proven a fertile time for its reemergence in the form of sponsorship programs like IHAD, and for a return to an emphasis on interpersonal contact and motivation in social programming.

With their substantial financial resources, sponsorship programs like IHAD have the potential to become major players in the social policy arena. However, an independent assessment of operations and impacts that could inform a policy debate has been lacking. Until very recently, Lang and many other sponsors prohibited formal research. However, the Board of Directors of the Greater Washington D.C. I Have a Dream Foundation authorized Public/Private Ventures to conduct this evaluation, the first independent assessment of a sponsorship program.

To simplify vocabulary, this report has adopted the language of the program. The acronym IHAD refers to the I Have a Dream name copyrighted by Lang and used by the Greater Washington Foundation. Unless otherwise indicated, IHAD will refer to the Greater Washington program for the remainder of this report. "Dreamers," hereafter used without quotation marks, refers to the youth who receive the program's benefits. "Sponsors" are the benefactors who fund the tuition guarantee and support services. Many people refer to "project coordinators," who are hired by sponsors, as "PCs," a title that can cause confusion in settings

where the same initials reference "personal computers." For this reason, the full title is used throughout this report. The report also uses the African-American racial descriptor favored by many Dreamers and IHAD staff.

To construct a description of the program model, interviews were conducted with the Greater Washington Foundation staff, four sponsors, six project coordinators and three school principals. To construct a socioeconomic profile of Dreamers, 1989-1990 school records were collected for Dreamers and non-Dreamers in the same grade at the three schools approved for study by their sponsors. In addition, P/PV conducted semistructured interviews with 14 Dreamers from these three schools and observed project coordinator interactions with Dreamers at school and summer school. Finally, P/PV interviewed five adults who had volunteered to mentor Dreamers in a class sponsored by their employers.

The classes participating in the study are all in the early years of the intervention. One class, sponsored in the fall of 1990, is currently in the seventh grade; the other two, sponsored in 1988 and 1989, are now in the eighth grade. Consequently, there is no description of the model's operation with high school students. Because long-term data on the three study classes are not yet available, IHAD's success in attaining its goals of high school graduation and college enrollment cannot yet be assessed. As a result, this report can only give preliminary indications of the model's effectiveness and raise issues about its implementation. An estimation of long-term effects must be the subject of future research.

This report presents findings of a one-year study of the IHAD model as it has been implemented in three schools in the Greater Washington D.C. area. It addresses three primary questions: What is the structure of the model? (Chapter II); What is the experience of the youth? (Chapter III); and, What are the program supports? (Chapter IV). The answers are summarized from a social policy perspective in a conclusions chapter.

II. THE MODEL

"The [I Have a Dream] model has never been clearly defined," one sponsor told a P/PV interviewer. "Each of us has gone through a learning curve; I invent as I go along." This chapter describes the Greater Washington D.C. IHAD model as it has been invented by its sponsors and staff.

STRUCTURE AND COSTS

As of September 1990, the Greater Washington IHAD Foundation was sponsoring eight classes. The first sponsor formed the Foundation and convened a class in 1987 after seeing Eugene Lang on television. Because of the cost of the intervention, only three of the classes have individual sponsors. Three are sponsored by pairs of businessmen, one by two professional athletes and a businessman, and one by two churches.

Structure

Each sponsor, or one member of a sponsoring group, has a vote on the Foundation's Board of Directors, which sets programmatic and fiscal policy. The Foundation has recently convened an advisory board composed of prominent educators and community leaders, as well as several sponsors, to review IHAD's program. An executive director coordinates daily operations and has responsibility for fundraising, public relations and program development. The Foundation pays a mandatory fee to the National IHAD Foundation, which has copyrighted the I Have a Dream name and logo.

The small staff and minimal operational requirements of the Foundation ensure that sponsors retain control over their Dreamer classes. "I liked the idea of control over how dollars would be spent rather than giving money to charity," one sponsor told a P/PV interviewer. "Money goes directly to the kids and I pretty much oversee every dollar." The structure also allows sponsors to personalize their intervention. "There is flexibility," this sponsor continued. "We can put our own stamp on the program."

Costs

Sponsorship costs benefactors an initial \$300,000, to cover the tuition guarantee, which is secured in an escrow account. Interest from the escrow account pays the salary of the project coordinator. The Foundation bills sponsors a total of \$100,000 in quarterly installments spread over six years to defray administrative expenses. The Foundation also advises sponsors to expect to contribute an additional \$150,000 for tutoring and enrichment activities.

Although the Foundation attempts to raise funds for incidental expenses, sponsors sustain most of these costs. For example, only half the \$200,000 cost of the 1990 summer institute was funded by grants; sponsors covered the remaining expenses. One pair of sponsors reported tutoring expenses of over \$50,000 after only two years.

Even if incidental expenses remain within the Foundation's \$150,000 estimate, per-pupil costs are high. The GAO reported \$923 per-pupil annual costs for the 37 sponsorship programs it surveyed. Preliminary calculations suggest that comparable costs in IHAD, based on \$550,000 for 60 Dreamers over six years, exceed \$1,500. Either way, funding an IHAD intervention remains an option only for the wealthiest individuals, groups of individuals, or organizations.

SELECTION OF DREAMERS

Although the IHAD Foundation has a selection policy, individual sponsors may impose their own criteria on the actual selection process. Preliminary analysis of demographic characteristics of three groups of Dreamers indicates that the selection process has favored very disadvantaged youth.

Policy

The IHAD model dictates that 60 entering seventh-grade students constitute a Dreamer class, regardless of the size of the student pool from which they are drawn. In addition, the Foundation strives to reflect geographic balance and economic need, indicated by school lunch eligibility, in its selection practice. The Foundation also requires the approval of school district officials and a building principal before a school is selected. One sponsor indicated that his favorable impression of a school's principal persuaded him to select that school. However, principals interviewed by P/PV felt they had no role in their building's selection; instead, they felt that such factors as school "stability" and "location in an economically and socially disadvantaged area" had been most persuasive.

The Foundation reports that a "cross section" of students is "randomly selected" from the available pool. In the two District of Columbia schools studied by P/PV, sponsors applied additional criteria. At one school, sponsors requested that standardized test scores of at least half the Dreamer class fall below grade level. At another, a magnet school, sponsors insisted that only students from the school's very disadvantaged neighborhoods be selected.

The Foundation assigns selection of individual students to the project coordinator and school principal or assistant principal. At one of the schools studied by P/PV, the project coordinator

had to "fill in empty slots" when some of the Dreamers initially chosen did not report to school. One year later, two non-Dreamers who had endeared themselves to staff were added to the class roster. At another school, the school's assistant principal added students to the Dreamer roster months after the program's inception "to fill the quota."

Students have the option of declining the selection, though few do. Parental consent is required and has always been obtained.

Practice

The three schools studied by P/PV demonstrate the application of these selection criteria. Two of the three groups of Dreamers studied by P/PV attend school in the District of Columbia: one school is in the Anacostia section, and is hereafter referred to as D.C. School #1 (Table 1); the other, a magnet school in the northwest section of the District, is labeled D.C. School #2. Sponsors of the third class requested that Dreamers attend school in Prince George's County, Maryland.

The Prince George's County sponsors selected an entire graduating fifth grade of 55 students in 1988. This group attended sixth grade together before scattering to several middle schools in the county district. Only the 36 who were at one middle school (in eighth grade during the 1990-1991 school year) are included in P/PV's study.

Both District of Columbia groups of Dreamers were selected from approximately 120 seventh-graders entering the two junior high schools. Students at D.C. School #1 were selected in 1989 and were in eighth grade during the 1990-1991 school year. Students at D.C. School #2, selected during the fall of 1990, were in seventh grade.

Table 1 displays characteristics of Dreamers and non-Dreamers for school year 1989-90 in the three schools studied by P/PV. Because of differences in selection years, the data present cross-sectional descriptions of Dreamers in the first, second and third year of program participation.

Dreamer groups show balanced gender representation and are composed overwhelmingly of African-American youth, though Prince George's County Dreamers include white, Hispanic and Asian youth as well. Nearly 45 percent of Dreamers at the Prince George's County middle school receive free or reduced price lunch; over 60 percent of Dreamers at D.C. School #2 and almost 80 percent at D.C. School #1 demonstrate this criterion of need. (The disproportionate rate at D.C. School #2, where less than 40 percent of non-Dreamers receive free or reduced price lunch, reflects the selection policy, which favored students from the school's disadvantaged neighborhood over students commuting to this magnet

Table 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF THREE IHAD-SPONSORED CLASSES
COMPARED TO SAME-GRADE, NON-SPONSORED STUDENTS
School Year 1989-90

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Prince George's County Middle School¹</u>		<u>District of Columbia Junior High School #1²</u>		<u>District of Columbia Junior High School #2²</u>	
	<u>Dreamer</u>	<u>Non-Dreamer</u>	<u>Dreamer</u>	<u>Non-Dreamer</u>	<u>Dreamer</u>	<u>Non-Dreamer</u>
Age as of 9/15/89	12.0	12.0	12.3	12.4	11.4	11.4
<u>Gender</u>						
Male	41.7%	56.8%	53.2%	41.8%	49.1%	41.9%
Female	52.8	43.2	46.8	58.2	50.9	58.1
<u>Ethnicity/Race</u>						
Asian	5.6	.4	--	--	--	--
African-American	83.3	56.8	100%	100%	100%	100%
White	8.3%	36.8%	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	2.8	6.0	--	--	--	--
<u>Lunch Status</u>						
Free	25.0%	22.6%	67.7%	82.0%	60.7%	37.9%
Reduced	19.4	10.5	8.1	9.0	3.3	3.0
Paid	55.6	66.9	24.2	9.0	36.0	59.1
Test Score (G.E.) ³	--	--	6.5	5.3	--	--
Mean Days Absent	14.3	16.4	29.3	33.7	--	--
Sample Size	36	266	62	67	61	66

¹The middle school includes grades six through eight. Dreamers were selected in the spring of 1988 as they graduated from elementary school (fifth grade). Ninety-two youth were excluded from the sample because of incomplete data or because of residence (indicated by zip code) in an affluent neighborhood.

²Grades seven through nine. Both groups of Dreamers were selected as they entered seventh grade, Fall '89 at D.C. School #1, Fall '90 at D.C. School #2.

³Grade Equivalent CTBS NCE test scores as of May 1990 at D.C. School #1 differ at $p < .01$ level of significance. Prior year's test scores and absentee records are not available for the entering seventh-grade class at the second D.C. School. Prince George's County uses the Maryland Test of Functional Ability

school.) Informal review indicates that the Prince George's County school lunch eligibility rate would be higher if all the district's Dreamers were included in P/PV's sample.

Grade equivalencies of test scores for D.C. School #1 indicate that, by May 1990, the end of their first year in IHAD, Dreamers were close to grade level. (Although mean ages also suggest the Dreamer groups were at grade level, fully one-third of Dreamers in both D.C. schools reported they had repeated a grade on a baseline questionnaire. See Table A.2, Appendix.) Grade equivalencies are not available for the tests used in Prince George's County. Differences between Dreamers and other same-grade students in terms of days absent are not statistically significant. (Previous test scores and absentee records are not transferred from elementary to junior high school, and thus are not available for the entering class at D.C. School #2.)

"Once a Dreamer, always a Dreamer" describes the program's official retention policy. However, Dreamers who change school districts must maintain contact with their project coordinator to remain eligible for the tuition guarantee. (One project coordinator observed by P/PV engaged in considerable outreach to maintain contact with distant Dreamers.) Dreamers also forfeit entitlement to the guaranteed tuition if they repeat a grade more than twice or drop out of school.

In summary, preliminary analysis of school data indicates that IHAD has selected youth who are disadvantaged according to economic criteria. Compared to peers, Dreamers are not more likely to succeed in school based on previous year's test scores and absentee records. Except for Prince George's County, where there is some racial diversity, the overwhelming majority are African-American, inner-city youth.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Only two support components in the IHAD model are mandatory: the tuition guarantee and the project coordinator. Other support services, such as tutoring, mentoring and enrichment activities, vary among schools and are described in Chapter IV.

The Guarantee

IHAD sponsors guarantee Dreamers postsecondary tuition equivalent to the cost of attending the University of the District of Columbia for four years. To redeem the guarantee, a Dreamer must enroll in a postsecondary program within two years of high school graduation. If the cost of tuition exceeds the amount of the guarantee, sponsors promise to assist Dreamers in seeking scholarships and student loans. In addition, many colleges and universities have made written commitments to the National IHAD

Foundation to provide tuition support for Dreamers who meet admissions standards.

The Project Coordinator

The goal of the project coordinator is "to support, encourage, stick with and inspire" 60 seventh-graders to attend postsecondary school or training. According to the Foundation's job description, their first responsibility is "to develop a personal relationship with each of the students to help them deal with academic and personal problems."

Selection

The Foundation's executive director screens applicants prior to final selection by sponsors. All project coordinators are college graduates, though formal training in education or social work is not a prerequisite. Instead, personal qualities such as commitment and caring are sought. All project coordinators must, as a condition of employment, make a six-year commitment to the position. There is no formal age requirement, though two sponsor teams disregarded colleagues' advice to hire 20- to 30-year-old "street-hip" males and selected mature women instead. Although not a requirement, all are African-American.

Roles and Responsibilities

One sponsor amplified the formal job description when he described his project coordinator as "a surrogate parent, cheerleader, and role model who can strike a chord with these kids." According to one project coordinator, the position meant being available for the Dreamers "24 hours a day, seven days a week."

Each project coordinator has a room or office in the school attended by the majority of Dreamers, providing an opportunity for daily contact with Dreamers in that school. All stressed the importance of regular contact with the Dreamers, even if not on a daily basis. "The main thing is to pay attention, [because] no one listens to them," one project coordinator told our interviewer.

However, in the Prince George's County school, only 36 of the 55 Dreamers originally chosen to participate in the program attend the school where the project coordinator's office is located. The remaining 19 attend school at 17 different locations. This project coordinator reported that he is at his office in the original school every day, though sometimes only briefly. He estimated that he has contact with the Dreamers there three or four times a week and sees the others in person about two or three times a month, though any may call him at home or in his office whenever necessary.

During several school visits over the course of the year, P/PV staff observed project coordinators providing assistance in a variety of ways. Several of these were quite dramatic: a project coordinator representing the family of a Dreamer at an out-of-state judicial hearing; a project coordinator bringing to school a Dreamer thrown out of his house by his mother. Many other activities appeared to be those routine tasks that are the foundation of caring: encouraging a Dreamer to attend a luncheon with a sponsor; congratulating a Dreamer on school improvement and boasting about this achievement to visitors; recruiting community activists from the neighborhood to assist with enrichment activities and mentoring; convincing a sponsor of an individual's need for tutoring; monitoring attendance at summer school; and procuring transportation to a picnic.

The project coordinators at the study schools spend substantial amounts of time transporting Dreamers, or driving among schools to which Dreamers have scattered. P/PV frequently observed project coordinators driving Dreamers to special events, such as school banquets, concerts or sporting events.

Project coordinators reported irregular contact with parents. One had attempted home visits after Dreamers were selected, but discontinued them after encountering indifference and even hostility from parents. Another regularly brought parents into the school for conferences. At one school, the project coordinator reported that parents had expressed interest in a parents' group, an innovation that at the time of this report was still in the planning phase.

Project coordinators told P/PV that they average about one telephone contact a week with one or both of their sponsors and meet with them approximately once a month. They also meet monthly as a group at Foundation headquarters and submit monthly reports about their Dreamers to the executive director and their sponsors. The Foundation has retained a psychologist/consultant, who attends these meetings and provides professional support. Project coordinators also demonstrate considerable informal support for each other, attending banquets and other functions at each other's schools. "We are a team," one project coordinator told P/PV, "and with the stress of the job, that's the only way to do it."

Relationship with the School

Because project coordinators are not employed by the school, they must create their role within a building. Although they have no official school responsibilities and work independently of the school schedule, project coordinators inevitably interact with school personnel as they counsel and advocate for Dreamer youth.

None of the school administrators P/PV interviewed identified any significant impediments to IHAD program implementation in their schools. One did mention, however, that although administrators in his school consider the project coordinator an invaluable resource, the teachers are not as laudatory. There is "some animosity," he commented. "[The project coordinator] is not restricted, but has freedom of movement...more access [than school employees]."

Another principal expressed a different attitude. "All school personnel, including teachers, open their arms," he told P/PV. "They are as supportive as they can possibly be." This principal found his project coordinator to be a valuable resource for "changing negative behavior" when Dreamers broke school rules. "When a Dreamer is in trouble, the project coordinator will intervene...come to the student's rescue," this principal went on. "My role is the bad guy. I let [the project coordinator] be the good guy." This principal also found the project coordinator useful at large gatherings, such as assemblies or lunch.

SUMMARY

The IHAD model created by sponsors and staff is an uncomplicated intervention for economically disadvantaged youth. The flexibility and informality preserved by the structure ensure sponsors some control over expenditures and give them direct access to staff and, intermittently, youth. The informality also frees project coordinators to invent a role that, at its best, allows them frequent and unstructured contacts with youth.

Compared to formal programs, IHAD is an anomaly. Neither effort nor performance is required for admission; expulsion is possible but rare. The major input, the tuition guarantee, is delayed for at least six years. Program supports (described in Chapter IV) vary among schools. No formal linkages with other agencies or institutions exist.

Nevertheless, the intervention demonstrates positive features often missing from traditional programs. Encumbered by bureaucracies and performance standards, traditional programs are frequently criticized for failing to enroll those most in need of their services and for failing to address their multiple needs. While the IHAD intervention is less structured and consistent than many programs, it is successfully targeted; its supports are subtle, but they are wide-ranging and are sustained for six years. Subsequent chapters will describe the supports and suggest how they are perceived by Dreamers.

III. BECOMING A DREAMER

From one day to the next, the circumstances of youth in this study changed dramatically: they learned that they had been singled out for a unique opportunity--if they successfully completed high school, their college tuition would be paid by one or several of Washington's wealthier citizens.

This chapter uses Dreamers' own words to describe the process by which they were selected and became IHAD participants. The quotes are drawn from interviews with 14 Dreamers from the three study schools, and are supplemented by quotes and background from principals and project coordinators.

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

The 14 Dreamers who were interviewed ranged in age from 12 to 15. All were at grade level: ten in the eighth grade and four in the seventh grade. Five reported that they regularly earned "high" grades, eight reported "average" grades and one "low" grades. Eight had been suspended from school at least once in the previous year.

Family and neighborhood conditions described by the students indicate that many came from severely disadvantaged backgrounds. Family configuration varied widely: five Dreamers reported intact two-parent families; six reported that parents had separated or divorced; one youth whose father was deceased lived with

mother; another lived with a guardian because both parents were deceased; and another lived alone with mother because father was in jail. During the interviews, youth mentioned only in passing such family stressors as custody battles, conflicts with step-parents, mental illness, unemployment and drug abuse by family members.

Youth's view of their neighborhoods fell into three categories. Five described their neighborhoods as "quiet" and "fairly safe." Three viewed their neighborhoods as "dangerous," though their families sheltered them from direct contact with dangerous persons or areas. These youth isolated themselves from neighborhood peers and indicated they "didn't pay attention" to crime and violence. The remaining six described a very difficult neighborhood. All six said they had witnessed shootings and murders; one of the six showed familiarity with guns and suggested experience in illegal activities.

SELECTION AND INITIAL REACTION

Surprisingly, the Dreamers interviewed had few precise recollections of their thoughts and feelings on first learning they had been selected for the IHAD program. Rather, their accounts reflect both excitement and confusion. One youth's initial bewilderment is reflected in this statement: "I don't usually pay attention to something unless they involve me in some way very much, or unless I understand it."

The Dreamers' recollections of their parents' reactions were considerably more vivid. In fact, it was through the reactions of adult family members that the students came to appreciate more fully what had happened. These statements are typical of Dreamers' descriptions of parents' reactions.

Said one: "They was just happy and telling everybody and stuff." Another youth described her father's reaction, which, though not verbal, was nonetheless expressive: "He was just happy, 'cause I could tell the way his face looked like. Sometimes I can just tell. He just seemed happy."

The description of a third Dreamer reflects both her own confusion and a high degree of parental enthusiasm:

One day, all of a sudden I heard my name called over the intercom. Me. All of us was in one class; they called us and we was coming downstairs--it was a lot of us in there all together. It was like 60 Dreamers, well it's really 59 now. So we was sitting in there and they was telling us about the program and gave us papers to sign and all that stuff, and I'm like "Huh!"

So I took it home and showed my mother, and my mother up there jumping for joy, crying and laughing and glad or somethin' and I'm still trying to figure out what she crying for. She calls everybody and reads the letter over the phone now, tell everybody that I'm in a program that sponsors for you to go to college.

And I'm still trying to figure out what I'm reading. I'm reading the paper over and over again. Still trying to figure out--then she's crying and hugging me and I'm just, I'm still, well I'm hugging her back and I ain't know why...and then she read the paper again and I say, "Oh, that's why." I mean she called my guardian, my aunt; she called my godmother, called my cousin, my Aunt Dot, my uncles, my Aunt Edie, lives all way down the country now, down in the country--and I'm still trying to figure out what's going on.

Family reactions like these instilled a high degree of excitement and anticipation in the youth themselves.

Once they understood that something special had taken place--something beyond ordinary expectations for young people coming from their families and neighborhoods--the Dreamers began to wonder why. Even though they had been told that their selection was "random," many correctly guessed that the process had not been entirely random. One youth with an appreciation of the theory of probability said that it could not be a matter of chance:

Because most of [Mr. X's] classroom and [Mr. Y's] classroom, all of his kids are in it. 'Cause if they were randomly selected, it wouldn't have been these two whole classes. They would have picked maybe half of that class and half of another class. There's five seventh-grade classes. Two of those classes got picked. Eighteen students were pulled up of the two classes. One class, nobody was picked out of that at all.

The youth at one school believed they had been chosen because of their scores on the California Achievement Test--as one girl stated, it was "probably because of the money and probably because of my test grades."

A student at another school thought such factors as behavior, academic achievement and socioeconomic status had been taken into account in the selection of Dreamers:

Yeah, I thought they picked them by how they did in school... if they were good, if they were bad; if they did their school work; if they didn't look like parents be able to pay for it. Stuff like that. You can find out how much a parent makes a year by just looking at their lunch money and everybody has access to that. All you got to do is ask the lunch counter.

Despite these observations, which were widely reported, no student among those interviewed complained about the selection methods.

COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NEW STATUS

Even for families already oriented toward high school graduation and college, the tuition guarantee came as a windfall. "It's good to be a Dreamer," one student told an interviewer, "but I probably would have still went to college if I wasn't one." However, she went on to describe what the guarantee meant for her brother and sister:

It probably didn't, but then again it did, 'cause my mother didn't know how she was gonna get Sean to college. That's my little brother. So with that money that I have, he's gonna keep on saving up and putting more money in and let it collect, and so that way he has enough money by the time he graduates from high school; he can go to college.

But for the larger number of youth, college was not an aspiration, for them or their families. Many of them struggled with the notion of a tuition guarantee for college. One student's comment illustrates the attempt to understand the aims of the program:

I think it's the way it's supposed to be, but it sounds like they're trying to prepare us for learning, and prepare us to go to college and stuff like that. Like I think that's what this program is doing.

With experience in the program came both a fuller appreciation of the promise of being a Dreamer and sense of enjoyment. Themes of college and career dominated interviews with these youth, who, in some instances, were able to name specific colleges they were interested in attending or speculate about career paths they might pursue.

Many agreed to be Dreamers despite expecting an unpleasant experience. One boy was worried because he "thought we were gonna wear uniforms or something like that." A girl said, "I expected it to be a boring old program, all you going to do, I thought it was going to just teach things. I never thought it was going to be so much fun." They had not anticipated the cultural and entertainment field trips that turned out to be their favorite part of the program.

Nor had they anticipated the support services (to be discussed more fully in Chapter IV) that were part of the program. In the thinking of at least one participant, the Dreamers learned the full scope of the program only incrementally:

Year after year, in the sixth grade, seventh grade and now eighth, they just tell us more of what we are going to do. In the fifth grade and in sixth grade, they told us what the project is really about and then I understood it. Then they started telling us like about projects that we are going to do.

As they began to appreciate the program benefits, Dreamers also began to experience envy from non-Dreamers. Some of the envy derived from the special status accorded Dreamers in school:

Well, like if one of the Dreamers will walk in he'll (the vice principal) say, "Hi, good morning," and give you a handshake and everything. If a person who is not a Dreamer walks in he'll say, "Hi, good morning," and say, "Have a good day," but he don't give you a handshake or nothing. To me it's not fair, 'cause we have more than other kids. We have more opportunities and he should just treat us equally--that way they won't be getting jealous over us.

Dreamers reported occasional taunting by non-Dreamers. "If they find out you a Dreamer, they'll say that you're a nerd, like you ain't smart or something like that," one student told an interviewer. "They do that because they not a Dreamer." One Dreamer said she coped with the envy by avoiding non-Dreamers or by keeping program activities to herself. "Probably because most of the people in the school who aren't Dreamers get jealous, I don't even talk about it to them. I just keep it to myself most of the time."

PRESSURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Although "Once a Dreamer, always a Dreamer" is official program policy, youth feel under considerable pressure to maintain good behavior and at least a C average, or risk losing their position in the program. As one youth described it:

Mr. X (the project coordinator), sometimes he'll say, "you have a choice if you want to be in this program or not." Because the way our behavior be, and stuff like that, and if you stay back, you're likely to be out of the program.

In fact, the program makes every effort to retain students who experience academic failure. In addition, the Dreamers themselves provide academic and emotional support to members of their group who are in trouble. A youth who was in danger of failing a grade received a great deal of support from his fellow Dreamers as well as the program staff. One of his classmates described his ongoing efforts to help him:

He is in danger of getting out of the Dreamers, so I'm trying to help him get his grades up, so we study together. He comes to my house on the weekends and stuff like that. We do stuff together and I tell him, "You've got to do it, chief, you got to do it. I don't want to see you drop out of the Dreamers, there ain't no reason."

Apparently, principals also felt pressures to prepare the Dreamers successfully for college. As one principal said:

Businessmen expect success. We have to deliver. The program demands accountability. The school is expected to make certain that these youngsters are prepared for pre-college academically. We're expected to keep track of these youngsters...They want to know how the boys and girls are doing.

In summary, even though the IHAD program in fact demands little of students and schools, both Dreamers and school personnel attribute high expectations to the program and strive to meet them.

TRANSLATING THE EXPECTATIONS

Although the Dreamers interviewed by P/PV had been with IHAD for no more than three years, they showed a range of comprehension of the meaning of the tuition guarantee.

For some students, the meaning was primarily monetary. When asked why she wanted to be a Dreamer, one youth said, "I get to go to college for free." Others were impressed by the size of the financial commitment made by sponsors. "By the time we do four years," one Dreamer told an interviewer, "you could have bought a Mercedes Benz and a Toyota." Another student linked his commitment to the program to the financial commitment made by sponsors. "Four years of somebody paying college for me," he explained, "that's a lot of money for someone to spend on me. I just can't turn that down."

A second group of youth are primarily aware of the expectations that accompany the guarantee: "[They're] trying to make me go to college, and do my schoolwork, and stay off the streets and stuff and get an education," one student told an interviewer. Another student attributed IHAD's success to the constant encouragement, even pressure, of IHAD staff. "Maybe [it's successful] because they want the Dreamers to be something in life other than dumb people," he told an interviewer. "Always on their back to do this or you won't get that grade or you won't do the next activity they do." (This student won a "most improved" award at a school banquet later that year.)

A third group, the smallest, appear to have adopted the IHAD goals as their own. One student described her reaction to her mother's signing the permission slip that allowed her to be in IHAD:

I decided I am going to go to college and make something of myself. I will be proud and my mother will be proud of me. But I want to be proud of myself. And I would like my mother to be proud of me, too.

The guarantee forced another student to confront personal goals:

It's helped me to think about life, making me think about what am I going to do, what am I going to do if the program drops me. It can make you think a whole lot about the future.

SUMMARY

For most students, the announcement of a guaranteed college tuition was a sudden and often confusing event that required the interpretation of key adults, especially parents. It was in the excitement of parents, most of whom had been denied a college education, that Dreamers began to appreciate the implications of the guarantee.

Day-to-day meaning accrued more gradually, filtered through reactions of peers, teachers and principals. For many youth interviewed for this study, the meaning of the guarantee still resided in the expectations of adults and the resentment of non-Dreamer friends. Interviews with others suggest, however, that some Dreamers begin to internalize a new set of expectations for their academic and social behavior that may accompany them to high school.

IV. PROGRAM SUPPORTS

An IHAD student has access to a wide range of personal, academic and cultural services aimed at helping him or her develop an orientation toward college. This chapter describes these services--personal relationships with project coordinators, sponsors and mentors; academic enrichment; and cultural enrichment. It also discusses variations in services to Dreamers. Since no two students receive quite the same amount or intensity of support services, the IHAD program varies for every student.

ADULT RELATIONSHIPS

Youth who participate in IHAD have access to a number of relationships with adults that are not available to their classmates who are not Dreamers. These relationships--with the project coordinator, the sponsor, and (in one program) an additional mentor--are key elements of the IHAD experience.

The Project Coordinator

The relationship with the project coordinator is a Dreamer's crucial link to the IHAD program. Project coordinators represent a continuous stable source of support for these youth. Unlike teachers, project coordinators provide a haven in the midst of a school environment that can be indifferent or competitive. Moreover, because there are few prescribed boundaries to the role, the project coordinator can extend his/her activities beyond the school to help with problems that may occur in a youth's home life.

Not surprisingly, many Dreamers have formed strong emotional attachments to the project coordinator. Youth from father-absent homes seem particularly responsive to male project coordinators. One youth described a relationship with his project coordinator that has extended well beyond school activities and implicated a range of emotions:

Especially the PC, he's fun too, he's like an uncle, a big uncle to us. When we be in trouble or something and we don't think it's right, sometimes he'll try and straighten it out. But if we're wrong, you've got to pay the consequences. He'll tell you when you're wrong, and he'll call your mother when doing wrong too, so I respect him. He's fun. Me and him we play basketball sometimes, hang out with him sometimes. Anytime we need him, all we got to do is call him. He don't complain or nothing. PC is a reasonable man, he understands your problems. He's a truthful man.

This student outlines the basic components of emotional support: advocacy, discipline, friendship and respect.

Another student with few significant adult attachments described her ease in confiding in the project coordinator:

But I can't talk to people about problems or things at home. I never could. I can't talk to my own mother. It's kinda hard, I guess. I don't know, but it seems when I get around [project coordinator], I can tell her anything, any and everything, and personal stuff-- things I won't even tell my mom. I don't know why.

An important part of the project coordinator's role is meeting individually with youth to discuss academic or social issues related to home, school or peers. Depending on their needs, students have upward of 20 such meetings in a given year. Students with strong family supports, good grades and good conduct have less contact, however. One student with these characteristics gave a fairly typical response:

He told us he was there to help, if you needed help with the work or if you were having problems with something you could come and talk to him...I think I only talked to him once about home. My mom and dad ask me about what I do in school.

In another instance, a youth was asked if the project coordinator helped him with his schoolwork:

No, not unless I do really horrible or something. Last year in English, I wasn't doing all my work. I really didn't do nothing. They call him (the project coordinator) to talk to me and the teacher gave me a chance to make up all the work.

In addition to formal meetings, Dreamers enjoy a significant amount of informal contact with the project coordinator on field trips, in "Dreamer" meetings and in brief exchanges in the halls and at lunch.

Through both formal and informal interaction, project coordinators consistently convey an expectation of high academic achievement. They become directly involved with Dreamers' academic progress by tutoring students or locating tutors for them; negotiating academic plans with their teachers; rewarding good work with field trips; and providing verbal reinforcement for good effort.

One youth described the way the project coordinator motivated her to improve in math:

I was getting good grades, but then I got a couple of Cs and one D. And when I got the D--this was in math, this was before I started studying math and getting good at it--he was just telling me that if I put my mind to it, I could get an A. So when we would take a test and everything, I put my mind to it and I got an A.

Dreamers' conduct was another area of concentration for project coordinators. The following comments demonstrate several Dreamers' concerns about improving their conduct, if for no other reason than to retain the project coordinator's good opinion:

He'll tell me to try not to get in no fights... He said he was disappointed at me yesterday when I was fighting because I told him why. And he told me I had a right to defend myself, but if I would have got suspended, he would have been mad at me...if we get into fights or anything with a person on a different team, then we're gonna get a worse punishment than the others, because we're supposed to be setting an example for the other people, because the pilot team is supposed to be the best team.

In summary, contacts with project coordinators are voluntary and students who choose to can interact with them in a wide variety of settings. Comments by some Dreamers indicate the complexity of some of the relationships and suggest these relationships may withstand separation and peer pressure when Dreamers reach high school.

Mentors

The IHAD program at one of the schools also provided mentors for the Dreamers. Approximately 30 employees of the sponsors' company "adopted" two Dreamers. They phoned the Dreamers, wrote them letters and attended company-sponsored trips and dinners with them. Additional contacts could be initiated if either the mentor or the youth desired.

This program was designed to provide additional acculturation for the students. As one sponsor stated, "We view the role of employee mentors as people who are going to be friends and provide some sort of enrichment...take kids out to dinner." Contact with mentors, then, was meant to be considerably less intense than contact with program coordinators.

Over time, however, the youth expressed a desire for more person-to-person contact with mentors. For instance, one youth remembered a trip she had taken with her mentor and was concerned about the cessation of contact since her mentor had entered the hospital:

Well, when we went to Union Station, we walked around the whole place and we went in and looked at stuff. It was fun. I like going places with her, and when we had the picnic, she couldn't come. She was recently in the hospital. I wonder how she's doing.

Mentors, for their part, were concerned that they know so little about the youth. Several felt that additional information on their families, schools and communities should have been shared with them prior to their first meeting.

This may have been a particularly salient issue given the differences in class and race between the mentors and youth. One mentor who had a particularly negative experience expressed this frustration:

Their values are 100 percent different from mine. And they may have all the family problems, too, behavior. I guess you would call it attitude, and even language. All of the things that distinguish inner-city kids to the rest of society are going to be a problem.

He recommended training for mentors and matching youth with mentors from similar backgrounds.

Sponsors

Although contacts between sponsors and Dreamers are infrequent, they are valued by both groups.

Most sponsors could not estimate the percentage of the youth they knew by name; inevitably, most felt they knew "the problem kids" better. One sponsor told P/PV he sees his class approximately six to ten times a year: "I don't know any of them very well. I can't imagine that happening for some time. It's hard to really connect." Another sponsor described his appreciation of the cultural differences between him and Dreamers: "It is virtually impossible for me to identify with them. The level of cultural deprivation is hard for me to understand." A sponsor whose class has reached high school reported that contacts have increased each year: "I think I feel the need, commitment and desire to see them more often."

However, personal contact seemed to be central to the meaning sponsors derived from this form of charity. IHAD is not "writing a check to the Red Cross or United Way," one sponsor, a very successful businessman, explained. "I happen to like involvement with the kids. I make them feel good and they make me feel good. I like to see the results of my investment, what change it's helping to make in the young people's lives. I'm not into museums." Another sponsor, a prominent athlete, expressed the same sentiment. "It's not a program where they just throw money

at a problem. You have to have hands-on involvement so kids can see and feel you. We're not just names in the wind."

Meetings with sponsors appear to make a vivid impression on Dreamers and reinforce IHAD's goals. One Dreamer described her first glimpse of her sponsors, which she associated with their message about achievement:

The sponsors came up to the school one night and they were talking about how they wanted us to get into college, how they wanted us to get out and succeed because there are not that many people getting into college. I felt proud, excited.

Another student attributed her motivation to be in IHAD to her contact with sponsors. "I felt like I had to be in it, because really for [Mr. X and Mr. Y], they just adopted the class, so you had to be in it." Another Dreamer expressed a wish for more contact with sponsors so that she could share her aspirations with them: "I would tell them how I'm doing in school and what I plan to do in the future, what my career goals are like." These comments suggest that some Dreamers develop commitment to IHAD's goals as a way to reciprocate sponsors' generosity.

ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT

At each of the schools, the Dreamers' regular classes were supplemented with other forms of academic enrichment. Varying in content, quality and intensity, these efforts were all intended to help make the dream of a college education come true.

In one school, sponsors brought in tutors from a private school for learning disabled children. As a result, according to one student, "Everyone has a tutor. Like four or five different tutors come, at different times of day." Dreamers were generally positive about this program:

It helps me a lot. I mean it helps me with math, English, you know, or if you have problems in any subject you can ask a [tutor] to help you and she'll help you.

Sponsors of this class were also able to procure scholarships for a few students to attend the private school for learning disabled youth. A student with long-standing academic difficulties spent his summer at this school and was surprised to find it enjoyable:

Yes, they said that I needed the help. They asked if I wanted to go for it, and I said, "Yeah," and like four of us went to the school for a day to see if we liked it. So I went. I wanted to go.

Sponsors of another school hired tutors from a professional agency to provide Dreamers tutoring at home or at school and the sponsors contributed to a PTA fund for teachers who provide after-school tutoring for Dreamers.

This traditional remedial approach was not very popular with Dreamers. One Dreamer with a poor academic record described his frustration with the repetitive tutoring methods:

I didn't want to go no more 'cause when I go to the tutor, he stay on one thing, and I don't like that. I just plain didn't want to go.

Several complained about the availability of tutors. "I wanted a tutor," one Dreamer explained, "but [the project coordinator] had problems getting me a tutor. I just gave up, saying, 'That's all right,' and finally did better in that class."

All the Dreamers at this school became beneficiaries of a grant the school district had received to test the effectiveness of high teacher/student ratios on academic performance. In addition to the higher teacher/student ratio, and a great deal of coordination between the "pilot team" teachers and the project coordinator, the Dreamers received special recognition, more intensive college preparation, and expectations from teachers of high standards for academic and social behavior.

Sponsors of the third school hired a master tutor who recruited and trained corporate volunteers. The intervention provides both traditional content tutoring and tutoring for learning disabled Dreamers. The project coordinator requires Dreamers with failing grades to attend tutoring sessions at least twice a week; students with better grades have the option of requesting help. Because this program was not implemented until October 1990, only one month after the class's selection, Dreamers from this school had no comments on it when interviewed by P/PV.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT

The purpose of cultural enrichment is to expose IHAD students to events, places and ideas to which they might not otherwise have access. Field trips and the summer program are the primary mechanisms for this exposure.

The Summer Program

The IHAD Foundation has provided a summer program for Dreamers for the past three years. For the 1990 summer program, the Foundation hired a consultant who designed a program that included experiential education in the morning and life skills training, using P/PV's Life Skills and Opportunities (LSO) curriculum, in the afternoon. Between 120 and 180 Dreamers, representing

approximately 30 to 50 percent of the youth in all seven classes, participated in the six and one-half-week program on the George Washington University campus.

Because the summer program was designated a Summer Youth Employment Project site, all Dreamers 14 years old or older who were District of Columbia residents were paid to do incidental tasks, such as setting up video equipment and doing lunchtime clean-up. The project coordinators attended the program every day and assisted with the LSO curriculum.

The curriculum divided students into business, arts and career training sections and attempted to integrate activities and academic remediation. One youth described the 1990 program as an improvement:

We were with the other Dreamers from the other schools. It was on a college campus. It was better than when we were in sixth grade and seventh grade. We didn't really do anything, but this one we made T-shirts and taught us about business. I think it was three parts. All were in business, art and career training, I think. The people in art, at the end, they did a play for us.

Another student especially liked the program because of the opportunity for contacts with other Dreamers: "I liked this summer program, because that's where we met new friends and we met all the Dreamers, a lot of the Dreamers, that we never met before."

Field Trips

Perhaps predictably, the field trips are the Dreamers' favorite program component. While some field trips exposed the Dreamers to familiar forms of American culture, others introduced them to places, people and situations that were foreign to them. One youth described a field trip to a television station, during which she had an opportunity to see celebrities and entertainers familiar to her through the media:

Oh, we went to BET. Yeah, we met Donnie Simpson and Dominique Wilkins. He's a basketball player...he is up there and I'm down here. It was nice. And then some people, they met Perfect Gentlemen and Michel'le and some singers. It was fun.

Another described with fervor her first dinner at a Japanese restaurant. It was clearly a novel experience for her and one she will probably never forget:

And we just went down there and we had lunch and we ate. They had the grill, the grill was on the table,

it was right there on the table and we ate around it and you could watch 'em and how the food kept poppin', and we was laughing. It was fun. I never went to one of these places where they cut the food. Then the table right there, and he just kept cooking and food is going everywhere, and it pops on your plate...And the food going all this way over, next behind him and he threw these things with the knives and I just moved right away 'cause I ain't trying to accidentally let that knife come and hit you.

Some sponsors viewed the field trips as opportunities to create an educational experience and provided introductions prior to the activities.

SUMMARY

The Greater Washington IHAD intervention provides intermediary supports to Dreamers that reinforce the long-term incentive of the tuition guarantee. Many of these supports are similar to those routinely supplied by parents in advantaged circumstances, but are all too often missing from the experiences of disadvantaged youth.

Although all sponsors provide concrete services, the content and frequency vary according to the resources of the sponsor, the ingenuity of the project coordinator and the interest and needs of Dreamers. The tutoring program differs among schools and in the frequency with which Dreamers receive or choose to make use of this benefit. Although enrichment activities are frequently available, they are also used as an incentive to promote and reward good behavior.

Interviews with Dreamers emphasize the role that adult relationships play in making this intervention effective. The project coordinator, using his or her relationship with the Dreamer, makes the tuition guarantee and the program supports meaningful for the youth. Dreamers also report vivid recollections of their infrequent contacts with sponsors and mentors.

In the early years of the intervention, then, the IHAD model provides Dreamers a balance of challenges and supports. As Dreamers enter high school, this balance well may shift. Scattered among district high schools, Dreamers may find the project coordinator less available on a daily basis. Entry into high school may also jeopardize the group cohesiveness that supports Dreamers and increase participants' vulnerability to less positive influences that characterize high schools in low-income minority areas.

It will be important to follow these youth as they make this transition.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND CONCERNS

The I Have a Dream intervention represents a response by a fortunate few individuals to the imbalance of educational benefits in the United States in the last decades of the 20th century. A creation of private sector individuals, the model attempts to redress deprivations that have challenged professionals at all levels of social practice.

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) has conducted a one-year review of the I Have a Dream program as it has been implemented in three schools in the Greater Washington area. Our review convinces us that the IHAD program we observed is a promising intervention that has some potential to help small numbers of disadvantaged youth achieve higher educational outcomes. Specific findings and related concerns are discussed below.

FINDINGS AND CONCERNS

1. The IHAD intervention has targeted and reached very disadvantaged youth. School data and interviews with youth confirm that youth selected to be Dreamers in three schools are very disadvantaged. Over three fourths of the Dreamers in the three schools qualified for free or reduced price lunches, and many resided in impoverished, dangerous neighborhoods. Almost all Dreamers from all three schools are minority youth; during interviews with P/PV, many described family problems that are the all-too-frequent corollaries of poverty status.

However, the severity of the needs of some of the youth gives rise to several concerns. P/PV observed several instances in which IHAD sponsors and staff were overwhelmed by special needs of Dreamers and their families. These needs--homelessness, family violence, arrests--would tax any practitioner. In each case, the sponsor and project coordinator attempted to address the crisis without programmatic guidelines or assistance from other agencies.

The response of sponsors and project coordinators in these cases is commendable. However, to protect project coordinators from burnout and sponsors from the dissipation of their resources, the Foundation may need a referral policy. Such a policy would identify agencies and outline procedures to access their services.

2. The timing of the IHAD intervention seems to be educationally and developmentally propitious. Because IHAD targets youth in their early adolescence, the program has the potential to promote positive academic and social behaviors. Although one-third of the Dreamers in both D.C. schools reported they had repeated at least one grade, they were all still in school. With testing and remedial tutoring, at least some of these youth may improve their

academic performance and thus be motivated to complete high school. Socially, Dreamers are, at least theoretically, as receptive to adult as to peer influences. Thus, IHAD has the potential to shape social development and enable Dreamers to avoid behaviors often associated with high school termination.

However, the timing of the intervention raises questions about whether or how the model will adapt when Dreamers reach high school. As Dreamers scatter to multiple high schools, the project coordinator's role may shift from mentor to case manager, and transportation demands on project coordinators will almost certainly increase. As Dreamers age, peer pressures may subvert educational goals. Long-term study is needed to address those questions.

3. The IHAD model seems to have a positive effect on Dreamers' attitudes toward education. The size and generosity of the financial commitment made by sponsors impresses Dreamers and reinforces positive attitudes toward education. Even youth who have never considered college revise their educational goals in the context of the tuition guarantee. The importance of education emerges like a refrain from interviews with Dreamers, sometimes repeated as the words of parents and the project coordinator, but also sometimes transformed into personal resolve.

Long-term study will be needed to determine whether these attitudes translate into high school graduation and college enrollment.

4. The role of the project coordinator is a valuable social policy tool in educating disadvantaged youth. Project coordinators can intercede with teachers and principals when Dreamers have academic or behavioral problems, and advocate for Dreamers within a school. With their access to sponsors, project coordinators can arrange additional services, such as tutoring or trips, and deliver concrete assistance during emergencies. Project coordinators drive youth to school, thus improving attendance, and bring in parents for teacher consultations, thus increasing parental involvement.

Structural components facilitate the project coordinator's role. Because they report to sponsors, project coordinators are independent of school schedules and politics. Consequently, they are available to youth after school hours and during school vacations, and, unlike principals and vice principals, cannot be assigned to another building. Because they are hired for six years, they remain affiliated with youth through junior and senior high school, regardless of school or class assignment. Because sponsors reimburse their transportation costs and fund trips and banquets, they have flexibility in the frequency, location and purpose of their contacts with Dreamers.

These features suggest that the project coordinator's role may be uniquely adapted to the needs of disadvantaged youth in inner-city schools. For this reason, the role of the project coordinator deserves further study to assess its potential for replication in other programs for disadvantaged youth.

5. The IHAD intervention provides adult relationships that are meaningful to youth. Both sponsors and project coordinators provide caring, consistent relationships that are valuable to Dreamers.

Despite infrequent contacts, sponsors are important to Dreamers. After meeting with sponsors, several Dreamers began to express their educational goals as a wish to make their sponsor proud. Their comments suggest that the importance of the tuition guarantee is amplified through its association with a powerful though distant individual whom a dreamer can expect to see for at least six years. Therefore, this personalization of the guarantee is therefore potentially a vital program component that is missing in tuition-guarantee programs without identifiable sponsors.

Project coordinators develop complex relationships with Dreamers that convey caring and high expectations on a day-to-day basis. P/PV observed project coordinators providing both discipline and encouragement in a wide variety of settings to a large number of Dreamers. Although not all youth choose to make use of the project coordinator, interviews with those who do indicate the depth of affection and respect in these relationships. Coordinators' availability is especially valuable to youth who have lost one or both parents, a characteristic of many in P/PV's study.

Hired because they live in or came from the same communities as Dreamers, project coordinators express a ready empathy for Dreamers and their families that Dreamers appreciate and sponsors respect.¹ The six-year commitment required of them by sponsors may promote the personal investment that project coordinators repeatedly demonstrate toward Dreamers and the intensity of their attachments.

These observations delineate the multidimensional aspects of caring. Although sponsors barely know their names, Dreamers perceive them as caring. Distance does not appear to interfere with this perception and may even enhance it, as Dreamers confer

¹ Social and emotional proximity to clients was also found to predict success for elders assigned to mentor at-risk youth. Freedman, Marc Partners in Growth: Elder Mentors and At-Risk Youth. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures, 1988.

on sponsors attributes of caring and power that transcend the financial guarantee. Feelings toward project coordinators are different, though equally vital, reflecting the day-to-day interactions that constitute the relationships. This combination of caring from both distant and proximate adults--each eliciting a different set of feelings--may be an especially potent formula, especially when offered for up to six years.

6. Support services, especially tutoring, are necessary program components but are provided unevenly. The tutoring program, the main educational support, varies in quality and intensity according to the resources of the sponsor, the ingenuity of the project coordinator and the needs and interest of youth. In two of the schools, Dreamers have access to testing and remediation for learning disabilities. In a third, only traditional tutoring is offered, but the school itself provides an academic enrichment program.

Enrichment activities and incentive awards are also inconsistently delivered within each school and among schools. The 1990 summer program, reportedly the best yet, failed to attract more than 50 percent of eligible Dreamers on a consistent basis.

The inconsistency of the services is probably inevitable within the present Foundation structure. Sponsors enjoy complete autonomy in their selection of which services to provide and at what frequency. Consistency across classes is not a Foundation goal and may well be undesirable, as flexibility protects against mediocrity and insures that at least some of the services will be of exemplary quality.

However, the quality of Foundation-wide activities, such as the summer school, is worrisome. Because of its modest organizational structure, the Greater Washington Foundation has had only a limited capacity to learn from its mistakes and capitalize on its successes. The Foundation already has in place two mechanisms that could be adapted to provide programmatic review: its advisory committee and monthly reports of project coordinators. Board members might consider adapting these vehicles to provide assessments of and recommendations for programmatic improvement.

SUMMARY REMARKS

Lang's intuitively derived model differs in many fundamental ways from public sector interventions or demonstrations. Nevertheless, it has several components that may enhance educational prospects for disadvantaged youth. One of these components, the tuition guarantee, has achieved wide currency in educational practice. Another, the project coordinator, has been adopted by many other interventions. Practitioners who believe in the importance of mentoring and in the utility of case managers find much that is analogous in the project coordinator's role.

However, IHAD's unique contribution may be exclusive to the private sector: an association with a wealthy and even famous benefactor. This benefit can have immense repercussions for a youth from a poverty background: a sudden change of luck, intermittent reminders of a special status, and a long-term commitment by a distant and powerful advocate. Publicly funded interventions can probably never deliver this sense of a special connection, or elicit the high expectations that youth--and some school officials--attribute to sponsors. That a major benefit of the model is therefore intangible should not obscure its value when it is assessed by concerned observers.

REFERENCES

- Berger, J. (1989). "East Harlem Students Clutch A College Dream." New York Times, 27 August.
- Fiske, E. B. (1989). "Impending U.S. Jobs 'Disasters': Work Force Unqualified to Work," New York Times, 25 September.
- Lubove, Roy (1977). The Professional Altruist. New York: Atheaneum.
- McMullan, B. J. and Snyder, P. (1987). Allies In Education: Schools and Businesses Working Together for At-Risk Youth. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Rutter, M. (1987). "Psychological Resilience and Protective Mechanisms." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry.
- U.S. Department of Education (1986). What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (1990). Promising Practice: Private Programs Guaranteeing Student Aid for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. GAO.

APPENDIX

Public/Private Ventures' (P/PV) one-year study of the Greater Washington I Have A Dream program (IHAD) included an assessment of the feasibility of conducting a longitudinal impact study. Only long-term study can address the questions of whether the IHAD model achieves its goal of high school graduation and college attendance. Comparison of IHAD youth (Dreamers) with youth similar in every way except participation in IHAD can indicate whether the program intervention is responsible for the desired outcomes.

This section describes the methodology for and findings from the feasibility assessment.

METHODOLOGY

Access

P/PV obtained access from IHAD sponsors to three classes. Two of the classes were in junior high schools (grades 7 to 9) in the District of Columbia. The third was in a middle school (grades 6 to 8) in Prince George's County, Maryland. School district officials gave P/PV permission to collect school records and to administer a baseline questionnaire to Dreamers and non-Dreamers in the same grade at these three schools. At the request of school officials, the three schools are not identified by name in this report.

Because all three groups of Dreamers had already been selected, an impact study with random assignment to treatment or control groups was not possible. Therefore, an effort was made to determine whether comparison groups could be constructed from non-Dreamers in the same grade as Dreamers in the three schools.

By the fall of 1990, the three classes were in different years of program participation. When selected in 1988, the Prince George's County (PGC) class had spent three years in IHAD. Dreamers in one District of Columbia school (D.C. School #1) were in their second year of program participation when selected in the fall of 1989. Dreamers in D.C. School #2 were selected in September 1990, one month before administration of the baseline questionnaire.

As a result, the data analyzed represent a true baseline only for D.C. School #2. For the remaining schools, it is impossible to tell with certainty whether treatment and comparison groups differed at baseline; consequently, variation between groups (described in the analysis section) cannot be ascribed to IHAD program effects.

Group Selection and Size

With the permission of school officials, P/PV collected school records for the 1989-1990 school year for Dreamers and non-Dreamers in the same grade at the three schools. (These data are displayed in Table 1 in the text of this report.) School data were released to P/PV without name or number identification.

In the two D.C. schools, the number of same-grade non-Dreamers approximately equaled the number of Dreamers (N=60 per school). As a result, all non-Dreamers in the same grade as Dreamers at these schools were included in the comparison groups. The analysis of baseline data (described below) is necessary to determine whether the Dreamer and non-Dreamer groups are comparable.

In the PGC school, where there were 36 Dreamers, P/PV was able to select a comparison group of 50 from a class of 252. To attain economic comparability, non-Dreamers from an affluent neighborhood were eliminated from the sample using the zip code. The remaining pool was stratified by race and sex based on school records data. Comparison group youth were randomly selected according to the proportion of each category represented in the Dreamer population.

The final sample from the three schools included 156 Dreamers and 190 non-Dreamers. Informed consent was obtained from 92 percent of the Dreamers and 68 percent of the prospective comparison group students.

The Baseline Questionnaire

The questionnaire included several assessments of demographic characteristics (Table A.1); as well as questions about educational characteristics (Table A.2), school-related behaviors (Table A.3) and social/cultural behaviors (Table A.4).

The questionnaire also contained several social psychological measures (Table A.5). Three scales from Harter's (1985) Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Children were included. The scales assessed perceived academic and social competence, and global self-concept (six questions per scale). The questionnaire also included the Nowicki and Strickland (1972) locus of control short form (21 items) for grades seven through twelve and a 12-item perceived adult support scale developed by P/PV.

Eighty-nine percent (N=139) of the Dreamers completed the survey: 86 percent at the PGC school, 92 percent at D.C. School #1 and 88 percent at D.C. School #2. Sixty-four percent (N=122) of the non-Dreamers completed the survey: 66 percent at the PGC school, 70 percent at D.C. School #1 and 57 percent at D.C. School #2.

DATA ANALYSIS

To determine the viability of the three non-Dreamer comparison groups, responses from the baseline questionnaire were analyzed. A series of t-tests and chi square tests was conducted to determine whether the three Dreamer and non-Dreamer groups in each school differed, and whether any differences reached statistical significance.

To be viable for long-term study, treatment and comparison groups must demonstrate similarity on variables that are not amenable to program influence, such as demographic characteristics. This test is especially important for the two D.C. schools, where class size precluded any choices in the selection of a comparison group of non-Dreamers. In addition, treatment and comparison group subjects must be initially similar on those measures that are amenable to program intervention, such as grades, attitudes or behaviors.

Because of variation among schools according to these criteria, they are discussed separately.

Prince George's County

The PGC Dreamers and non-Dreamer comparison group do not differ on three of the four demographic variables. However, significantly more Dreamers than non-Dreamers reported that their mothers are currently employed ($p < .10$). Because the mother's employment has economic and social implications for family functioning, this variable suggests that the Dreamer and non-Dreamer groups are not similar according to background characteristics.

The two groups also differ on three indicators of educational characteristics. Dreamers are less likely than non-Dreamers to report that they have repeated a grade ($p < .05$); in addition, Dreamers have higher educational expectations than non-Dreamers ($p < .10$) and report higher grades ($p < .05$). Dreamers and non-Dreamers do not differ with respect to self-reported negative and positive school behaviors.

However, the groups do differ on several indicators of cultural enrichment. Dreamers are significantly more likely than non-Dreamers to report visiting a college, or attending a dance or music concert. None of the differences on the six attitude and support scales is statistically different.

D.C. School #1

At D.C. School #1, Dreamers also differ from non-Dreamers in the frequency with which they report that their mother is employed ($p < .10$). However, Dreamers and non-Dreamers report similar

educational characteristics, including post-high school expectations. Dreamers are less likely than non-Dreamers to report that they "never" skip a class, but more likely than non-Dreamers to report that they "never" steal ($p < .10$ on both questions); otherwise, self-reported school behaviors are similar. Dreamers and non-Dreamers also report similar social and cultural behaviors, even in those areas where IHAD's enrichment activities could be expected to have had an effect. Finally, Dreamers show a higher global self-concept ($p < .10$) than non-Dreamers, though the groups are similar on the other five attitude and support scales.

D.C. School #2

The gender distribution at D.C. School #2, is approximately even among Dreamers, but the non-Dreamer group includes significantly more females ($p < .05$). Because the non-Dreamer distribution reflects the school's enrollment (Table 1), it is unlikely to vary even if more non-Dreamers are enrolled in the study. Dreamers and non-Dreamers do not differ on the three other demographic measures included in the study.

Dreamers are also similar to non-Dreamers on most of the indicators of educational characteristics and behaviors. Dreamers are significantly more likely than non-Dreamers to report no school absences in the four-week period preceding the date of the questionnaire, and that they never skip class ($p < .10$ for both). Dreamers are less likely than non-Dreamers to report frequent (3 or more times) attendance at dance concerts ($p < .05$), but the groups show no differences on the six attitude and support scales.

SUMMARY

In summary, Dreamers and youth selected for non-Dreamer comparison groups are different on a range of measures. Most of these differences are in the PGC sample on measures amenable to program intervention. Because PGC Dreamers had three years of program participation before administration of the questionnaire, it is impossible to determine whether the differences predate or result from program participation. Because of the number and direction of these differences, we recommend excluding the PGC sample from long-term study.

However, differences are less numerous in the two D.C. schools, which were at or within one year of baseline when the questionnaire was administered. As a result, these samples may be viable for a longitudinal case study design, where the requirements for comparability are less stringent than impact study methodologies. Additional data collection can yield a fuller range of indicators of demographic characteristics to determine the groups' initial similarities. Measures reactive to program influences on which the groups presently differ can either be dropped from subsequent analysis or analyzed to reflect cumulative differences.